

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

NACIM BOUCHTIA,

CASE NO. 2:25-cv-00838-JNW

Plaintiff,

STAY ORDER

V.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
STATE,

Defendant.

This matter comes before the Court on the parties' stipulated motion to extend any responsive pleading deadline to August 12, 2025, and temporarily stay this case. Dkt. No. 5.

In this Court, “[p]arties may agree to extend the time for a defendant to answer or otherwise respond to a complaint. So long as the parties agree to an extension, there’s no need to file a stipulation with the Court.” § 5.3, Chambers Procedures – Civil (<https://www.wawd.uscourts.gov/judges/whitehead-chambers>). As such, the parties’ request to extend the answer deadline is needless. Nevertheless, the Court GRANTS the request.

1 As for the stay motion, “the power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power
2 inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with
3 economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.” *Landis v. N. Am.*
4 *Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936). In determining whether a stay is appropriate, the Court
5 must weigh various interests, including: (1) the possible damage to result from granting
6 the stay; (2) the hardship to the parties if the suit proceeds; and (3) the “orderly course
7 of justice measured in terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and
8 questions of law which could be expected to result from a stay.” *Lockyer v. Mirant Corp.*,
9 398 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2005).

10 Weighing the claims made in the parties’ stipulation against the relevant factors,
11 the Court finds that a stay will likely advance judicial economy by facilitating dispute
12 resolution without the needless expenditure of time and resources on litigation. As
13 such, the Court GRANTS the request for a stay and STAYS this action in its entirety.

14 Finally, as proposed by the parties, the Court DIRECTS the parties, by no later
15 than August 12, 2025, to file a “joint status report apprising this Court regarding
16 resolution efforts, or alternatively propos[ing] a briefing schedule for resolution, if
17 needed.” See Dkt. No. 5 at 1.

18 It is so ORDERED.

19 Dated this 13th day of June, 2025.

20 
21 Jamal N. Whitehead
22 United States District Judge
23